



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/391,772	09/08/1999	WALTER V. DIXON III	RD-27.422	9058

7590 09/10/2003

JOHN S BEULICK
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600
ST LOUIS, MO 631022740

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/391,772	DIXON ET AL.
	Examiner Ella Colbert	Art Unit 3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2, and 5-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 2, 5-18 are pending in this communication filed 06/26/03 entered as RCE, paper no. 13, Extension of Time (2 Months), paper no. 14, and Substitute Spec, paper no. 15. Applicants' future claim amendments need to be in compliance with the new amendment format showing each pending claim as to whether the claim has been amended or unamended and cancelled.
2. Applicants' Substitute Specification has been reviewed and approved.
3. Applicants' 35 USC 112 second paragraph for claims 1, 2, and 6-18 have been overcome by Applicants' amendment to claims 1,2 and 6-18 and is hereby withdrawn.
4. The Objection To The Title Of The Invention is hereby withdrawn in view of Applicants' claim amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by (US 5,608,874) Ogawa et al, hereafter Ogawa.

With respect to claim 1, Ogawa teaches, generating at the accounting system a report having at least one of a defined report format and a defined translation service; (col. 8, lines 35-38 and lines 51-63 and col. 9, lines 1-6, lines 12-22, lines 34-36, and lines 45-50); exporting the report from the accounting system to a local file system (col.

8, lines 51-60 and col. 19, lines 1-6); submitting the report from the local file system to the server (col. 28, lines 13-28, fig. 3(21 & 30), fig. 4 (170 & 160), and fig. 10 (720)); determining at the server whether the submitted report has the at least one of the defined report format and the defined translation service (col. 10, lines 18-42); and extracting via the server information from the report based on at least one of the defined report format and the defined translation service to generate at least one exhibit to the report, the at least one exhibit summarizing specific information included in the report (col. 28, lines 30-67). An accounting system by definition is the methods, procedures, & standards followed in accumulating, classifying, recording, & reporting business events & transactions. The accounting system includes the formal records & original source data. Regulatory requirements may exist on how a particular accounting system is to be maintained (e.g. insurance company).

With respect to claim 8, Ogawa further teaches, An automated lending system comprising an accounting system coupled to a local file system (col. 8, lines 60-63), and a server (col. 8, lines 22-28) for communicating with the local file system (col. 8, lines 44-50), said accounting system configured to generate a report having at least one of a defined report format and a defined translation service (col. 8, lines 34-39). This independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Ogawa teaches, submitting the report comprises attaching the report to a web form (col. 8, lines 15-27 and col. 10, lines 27-45).

With respect to claim 9, Ogawa teaches, the local file system is accessible by a browser (col. 18, lines 5-10).

With respect to claim 11, Ogawa teaches, wherein generating at the accounting system a report having at least one of a defined report format and a defined translation service further comprises generating at the accounting system a report having a defined report format (col. 14, lines 29-39 and col. 15, lines 5-33).

With respect to claim 12, Ogawa teaches, wherein extracting via the server information from the report further comprising utilizing the defined translation service at the server to extract information from the report and then generate at least one exhibit based on the extracted information (col. 9, lines 12-22).

With respect to claim 14, A method in accordance with claim 6 wherein extracting via the server information from the report further comprising the steps of: determining whether to utilize the defined translation service to extract information included in the report (col. 9, lines 38-43); utilizing at the server, if needed, the defined translation service to extract information included in the report and then generate the at least one exhibit based on the extracted (col. 10, lines 21-26).

This claim is also rejected for the similar rationale given above to claim 12.

With respect to claim 16, this claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claims 12 and 14.

With respect to claim 17, this independent claim is rejected for the similar rationale as given above for claims 1, 6, and 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3624

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5, 7, 10, 13, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa in view of (US 5,864,871) Kitain, hereafter Kitain .

With respect to claim 5, Ogawa did not teach, extracting information from the report using a print scraping process.

Kitain discloses, extracting information from the report using a print scraping process (col. 5, lines 28-36). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have extracting information from the report using a print scraping process and to modify in Ogawa because such a modification would allow Ogawa to have printable documents and a common viewing format such as, PDF format.

With respect to claim 7, this dependent claim is rejected for the similar rational given above for claim 5.

With respect to claim 10, Ogawa did not teach, wherein the local file system is accessible by a browser, and wherein submitting the report from the local file system to the server further comprises submitting the report from the local file system to the server using the browser.

Kitain discloses, wherein the local file system is accessible by a browser, and wherein submitting the report from the local file system to the server further comprises submitting the report from the local file system to the server using the browser (col. 1, lines 61-67, col. 2, lines 1-14, col. 11, lines 43-54, col. 13, lines 18-37, col. 15, lines 59-

67, col. 16, lines 1-8, and col. 33, lines 49-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the local file system is accessible by a browser, and wherein submitting the report from the local file system to the server further comprises submitting the report from the local file system to the server using the browser and to modify in Ogawa because such a modification would allow Ogawa to have browser programs executed by the user computer and the user is able to simply make a request to a remote server for the file.

With respect to claim 13, Ogawa teaches, wherein extracting information from the report using a print scraping process further comprises; determining whether preprocessing of the report is needed (col. 16, lines 49-53); performing a document recognition process including scanning the report to determine a file type of the report and comparing the file type to a list of known file types stored in a data repository (col. 22, lines 32-40); and performing a mapping and translation process on the report including selecting an extraction script based on the document recognition process for extracting and translating data from the report (col. 26, lines 1-19 and lines 42-63).

With respect to claim 15, this claim is rejected for the similar rationale given above for claim 13.

With respect to claim 18, this claim is rejected for the similar rationale given for claims 13 and 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3624

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 5,608,874) Ogawa et al, hereafter Ogawa in view of (US 6,266,150) Brossman et al, hereafter Brossman.

Ogawa substantially teaches all of the claim limitations of claim 6, except, transmitting the report from the accounting system to the server via the virtual printer.

Brossman discloses, transmitting the report from the accounting system to the server via the virtual printer (col. 3, lines 23-64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmitting the report from the accounting system to the server via the virtual printer and to modify in Ogawa because such a modification would allow Ogawa to have an information determination unit which determines whether another or at least one other device is available to support a functional upgrade of the printer itself based upon the ability information which was transmitted from other devices connected to the network in response to the inquiry for the ability information, and determines its printer's own virtual printer information.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 04/28/03 are considered "moot" in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Davidson,Jr. et al (US 5,550,957) disclosed a virtual printer network.

Molinarni et al (US 6,016,482) disclosed a system for managing financial transactions.

Highbloom (US 5,323,315) disclosed collateral for securing financing.

Davidson (US 5,699,527) disclosed a system for processing a loan.

Sheard et al (US 6,453,356) disclosed formatting and translating documents in a data exchange system.

Kleinerman (US 6,041,365) disclosed an electronic data interchange system.

Brock, Horace R., disclosed accounting principles.

Inquiries

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7687 (Official Fax) and (703) 746-5622 (Unofficial Fax).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



E. Colbert
September 8, 2003